arXiv:1611.06346v2 [math.DS] 22 Nov 2016

Quasi-Poincaré compactifications and blow-up solutions of ordinary differential equations

Kaname Matsue*, †

November 23, 2016

Abstract

We construct a generalized compactification of Euclidean spaces as well as dynamical systems on them for studying blow-up solutions of ordinary differential equations. The basic idea is based on the quasi-homogeneous desingularization (blowing-up) of singularities. We apply this desingularization to infinity so that divergent solutions including grow-up and blow-up solutions for differential equations whose asymptotic form is not necessarily homogeneous can be treated on compact spaces. As a prototype, we define the quasi-homogeneous version of Poincaré compactifications and discuss fundamental properties which play important roles to study blow-up solutions of inhomogeneous vector fields. As a demonstration of applicability, we consider singular shock waves consisting of several pieces of blow-up solutions and bounded solutions near infinity. We see that the quasi-Poincaré compactification well describes singular profiles of singular shocks observed in preceding studies.

Keywords: Poincaré compactifications, quasi-homogeneous desingularizations, blow-up solutions of ODEs, singular shocks.

AMS subject classifications : 34A26, 34C08, 35B44, 35L67, 58K55

1 Introduction

The blow-up phenomenon, which describes divergence of solutions in finite time, is one of typical and essential singular behavior in dynamical systems generated by nonlinear differential equations. There are many mathematical and physical studies of blow-up behaviors, and their concrete behavior such as blow-up profile, blow-up rate and blow-up sets are ones of central issues in studies of blow-up solutions.

The difficulty for studying blow-up solutions is mainly the treatment of *infinity* from both mathematical and numerical viewpoints. Scaling of solutions is often used for detecting the asymptotic profile of blow-up solutions [6], which is one of the most essential approach of blow-up solutions in the category of *bounded* objects.

*Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan kmatsue@imi.kyushu-u.ac.jp

†International Institute for Carbon-Neutral Energy Research, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan

An alternative way to studying blow-up solutions as those in bounded region is *compactification*. This methodology embeds the original phase spaces, which is often the Euclidean spaces, into compact manifolds possibly with boundaries, and maps dynamics on the original phase space to those on compact manifolds. Infinity is then mapped into extra points or points on the boundary of compact manifolds. Such a treatment enables us to consider divergent solutions including blow-up solutions in terms of bounded solutions on compact manifolds. Well-known compactifications are Bendixson's one, embedding of $\mathbb{R}^n$ into the unit n-sphere S^n, and Poincaré's one, embedding of $\mathbb{R}^n$ into the unit upper hemisphere $\{(x_1, \cdots, x_{n+1}) \mid x_{n+1} > 0, \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i^2 = 1\}$ (see e.g., [7]). In [5], an admissible class of compactifications including the Poincaré compactification is discussed, which gives an appropriate correspondence of dynamics between on the original phase spaces and on compactified manifolds. Such compactifications are recently applied to validating blow-up solutions of ordinary differential equations (ODEs for short) with *rigorous numerics*, a series of techniques so that all numerical errors are included in all numerical results by, say intervals, and that resulting numerical results contain mathematically rigorous objects [23]. The result opens the door to studying blow-up solutions as *finite-time singularities* from the viewpoint of computer-assisted analysis of dynamical systems.

A typical property of admissible compactifications, as well as well-known Bendixson's one, is that all transformations are *homogeneous*, namely, $y_i \mapsto y_i/\kappa$ for all i with a positive functional $\kappa = \kappa(y)$. Such a transformation yields the property that dynamics at infinity is dominated by the highest order term of vector fields, which means that all remaining lower-order terms have no effects at infinity. This property may drop genuine information of dynamics near infinity. For example, consider the system

$$u' = u^2 - v, \quad v' = \frac{1}{3}u^3. \tag{1.1}$$

It is discussed in e.g., [17] that this system admits blow-up solutions with appropriate initial data. On the other hand, if we applied compactifications which we mentioned above to this system, the behavior at infinity would be roughly dominated by

$$u' = 0, \quad v' = \frac{1}{3}u^3,$$

since the highest order term is u^3 and all other lower-order terms are dropped, according to arguments of compactifications (e.g., [5]). In particular, traditional compactifications are not appropriate when we study blow-up phenomena of *inhomogeneous systems*.

Meanwhile, divergent solutions are typically transformed into global trajectories asymptotic to equilibria on the boundary of compactified spaces via admissible compactifications. This correspondence indicates that divergent solutions are characterized by *invariant sets such as equilibria* on the boundary of compactified spaces. In general, dynamics around (bounded) equilibria are characterized by their *normal forms*, which possess essential information of dynamics around equilibria, whose leading terms are not always homogeneous. In order to specify such essential information, the *desingularization*[1] is often applied. This operation leads to simpler treatments for studying dynamics around equilibria. Nevertheless, if an equilibrium is so degenerate, we need successive

[1] In the terminology of algebraic geometry or ordinary singularity theory of dynamical systems, it is often called *blow-up*. However, we shall use the terminology *desingularization* here to avoid any confusions to *blow-up solutions* of differential equations.

desingularization to obtain essential information of dynamics, which makes our analysis of singularity expensive. In order to overcome such a difficulty, there is a methodology such that an essential information of such equilibria can be extracted in *one* desingularization, which is called *quasi-homogeneous desingularization* (e.g., [3]). This desingularization effectively classify equilibria (e.g., [1]) from the viewpoint of algebraic geometry.

Our main aim in this paper is to construct a new class of compactifications by using quasi-homogeneous desingularizations so that the essential behavior of dynamics at infinity can be extracted, even for inhomogeneous vector fields. The viewpoint regarding infinity as a singularity, as seen in traditional compactifications, gives us an expectation that "*quasi-homogeneous desingularizations of vector fields at infinity*" transform divergent solutions to global trajectories in bounded regions in an appropriate manner. As a starting point, we generalize traditional Poincaré compactification using quasi-homogeneous desingularizations in this paper. One will see that this idea perfectly matches preceding theory of compactifications and extends the possibility of the analysis of blow-up solutions.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce a new compactification called quasi-Poincaré compactification, with a brief review of quasi-homogeneous desingularizations. This compactification is an appropriate generalization of well-known Poincaré compactification. In Section 3, we discuss the transformation of dynamics via quasi-Poincaré compactifications. There we also introduce desingularizations of time variables so that dynamics at infinity makes sense. The whole arguments there give appropriate generalizations of dynamical systems via traditional Poincaré compactifications. In Section 4, we show several generic results for describing blow-up solutions in terms of global trajectories of dynamical systems. An essential tool such as the Hartman-Grobman Theorem for describing asymptotic behavior of dynamics around equilibria appears there, which will lead to further analysis of blow-up solutions in terms of stability analysis. In Section 5, we demonstrate an application of the present compactifications to an inhomogeneous system involving (1.1) with numerical simulations. We consider the system of traveling wave equations for a system of conservation laws admitting non-classical solutions of Riemann problems called *singular shock waves*, which admit Dirac delta singularities at shock discontinuities. Following preceding works such as [17], we construct a collection of blow-up solutions and bounded solutions at infinity in terms of quasi-Poincaré compactifications and associated vector fields. As a result, we see that our constructed collection of trajectories well describes fundamental features of singular shocks, which will give a perspective of an alternative description of blow-up behavior including singular shock mechanism.

2 Quasi-Poincaré compactifications

In this section, we introduce an alternative compactification of admissible ones discussed in e.g., [15, 7, 5]. Our compactification is based on an appropriate scaling of vector-valued functions at infinity and the concept of quasi-homogeneous desingularization of singularities in dynamical systems. Firstly we briefly review quasi-homogeneous vector fields. Secondly, we introduce the new compactification called *quasi-Poincaré compactification* and provide several fundamental properties.

2.1 Quasi-homogeneous vector fields

Definition 2.1 (Quasi-homogeneous vector fields, e.g., [3, 4])**.** Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. Let $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n, k \geq 1$ be natural numbers. We say that f is a *homogeneous function of type* $(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ *and order* k if

$$f(r^{\alpha_1} x_1, \cdots, r^{\alpha_n} x_n) = r^k f(x_1, \cdots, x_n), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad r \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Next, let $X = \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ be a smooth vector field. We say that X, or $f = (f_1, \cdots, f_n)$ is a *quasi-homogeneous vector field of type* $(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ *and order* $k+1$ if each component f_j is a homogeneous function of type $(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ and order $k + \alpha_j$.

For applications to general vector fields, in particular for dynamics near infinity, we define the following notion.

Definition 2.2 (Asymptotically quasi-homogeneous vector fields)**.** Let $f = (f_1, \cdots, f_n) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smooth function. We say that $X = \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$, or simply f is an *asymptotically quasi-homogeneous vector field of type* $(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ *and order* $k+1$ *at infinity* if

$$\lim_{r \to +\infty} r^{-(k+\alpha_j)} \left\{ f_j(r^{\alpha_1} x_1, \cdots, r^{\alpha_n} x_n) - r^{k+\alpha_j} (f_{\alpha,k})_j(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \right\} = 0$$

holds local uniformly for $(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $f_{\alpha,k} = ((f_{\alpha,k})_1, \cdots, (f_{\alpha,k})_n)$ is a quasi-homogeneous vector field of type $(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ and order $k+1$.

2.2 Definition and properties

Throughout successive sections, consider the (autonomous) polynomial vector field

$$y' = f(y), \tag{2.1}$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smooth function. Throughout our discussions, we assume that f is an asymptotically quasi-homogeneous vector field of type $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ and order $k+1$ at infinity.

Definition 2.3 (Quasi-Poincaré compactification)**.** Fix natural numbers $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n, k \geq 1$. Let $\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n$ be natural numbers such that

$$\alpha_1 \beta_1 = \alpha_2 \beta_2 = \cdots = \alpha_n \beta_n \equiv c \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.2}$$

Define *quasi-Poincaré functionals* $p(y)$ and $\kappa(y)$ as

$$p(y) := \left(y_1^{2\beta_1} + y_2^{2\beta_2} + \cdots + y_n^{2\beta_n} \right)^{1/2c}, \quad \kappa(y) := (1 + p(y)^{2c})^{1/2c}.$$

Define the *quasi-Poincaré compactification of type* $(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ as

$$T_{qP} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n, \quad T_{qP}(y) = x, \quad x_i := \frac{y_i}{\kappa(y)^{\alpha_i}}.$$

We immediately observe that $p(x) \to 1$ as $p(y) \to \infty$, and vice versa. Therefore, the infinity in the original coordinates corresponds to a point on

$$\mathcal{E} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid p(x) = 1\}.$$

Note that the quasi-Poincaré functional κ in the x-coordinate is

$$\kappa(T_{qP}^{-1}(x)) = \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j^{2\beta_j}\right)^{-1/2c}.$$

Remark 2.4. The simplest choice of the natural number c is the least common multiple of $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n$. Once we choose such c, we can determine the n-tuples of natural numbers $\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n$ uniquely. The choice of natural numbers in (2.2) is essential to desingularize vector fields at infinity, as shown below.

Definition 2.5. We say that a solution orbit $y(t)$ of (2.1) with the maximal existence time (a, b), possibly $a = -\infty$ and $b = +\infty$, *tends to infinity in the direction* $x_* \in \mathcal{E}$ *associated with the quasi-Poncaré functional* p (as $t \to a + 0$ or $b - 0$) if

$$p(y(t)) \to \infty, \quad \left(\frac{y_1}{\kappa(y)^{\alpha_1}}, \cdots, \frac{y_n}{\kappa(y)^{\alpha_n}}\right) \to x_* \quad \text{as } t \to a + 0 \text{ or } b - 0.$$

Now compute the Jacobian matrix of T. Direct computations yield

$$\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_j} = \kappa^{-\alpha_i}\left(\delta_{ij} - \kappa^{-1}\alpha_i y_i \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial y_j}\right)$$

with the matrix form

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \left(\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_j}\right)_{i,j=1,\cdots,n} = A_\alpha\left(I_n - \kappa^{-1} y_\alpha (\nabla\kappa)^T\right), \\ A_\alpha &= \operatorname{diag}(\kappa^{-\alpha_1}, \cdots, \kappa^{-\alpha_n}), \quad y_\alpha = (\alpha_1 y_1, \cdots, \alpha_n y_n)^T. \end{aligned}$$

We following arguments in [5], for any (column) vectors $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, to have

$$\begin{aligned} (I_n + \beta y z^T)(I_n + \beta y z^T) &= I + (\beta + \delta) y z^T + \beta\delta y z^T y z^T \\ &= I + (\beta + \delta + \beta\delta\langle z, y\rangle) y z^T, \end{aligned}$$

so $I + \delta y z^T = (I + \delta y z^T)^{-1}$ if $\delta = -\beta/(1 + \beta\langle z, y\rangle)$.

In this case, we choose $\beta = -\kappa^{-1}, y = y_\alpha, z = \nabla\kappa$ and have

$$\left(\frac{\partial y_j}{\partial x_i}\right) = \left(\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_j}\right)^{-1} = \left(I_n - \frac{1}{\kappa - \langle y_\alpha, \nabla\kappa\rangle} y_\alpha (\nabla\kappa)^T\right) A_\alpha^{-1}$$

Now we have

$$\frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial y_j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^{2\beta_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{2c}} = \frac{\beta_j}{c}\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^{2\beta_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{2c}-1} y_j^{2\beta_j - 1} = \frac{\beta_j}{c\kappa^{2c-1}} y_j^{2\beta_j - 1}$$

and hence

$$\kappa^{2c-1}\left(\kappa - \langle y_\alpha, \nabla\kappa\rangle\right) = \kappa^{2c-1}\left(\kappa - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j y_j \frac{\beta_j}{c\kappa^{2c-1}} y_j^{2\beta_j-1}\right) = \left\{(1+p(y)^{2c}) - p(y)^{2c}\right\} > 0,$$

which indicates that the transformation T_{qP} as well as T_{qP}^{-1} are C^1 locally bijective including $y = 0$. On the other hand, the map T_{qP} maps any one-dimensional curve $y = (r^{\alpha_1}v_1, \cdots, r^{\alpha_n}v_n)$, $0 \le r < \infty$, with some fixed direction $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, into itself (see also Section 2.3 below). For continuous mappings from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}$, local bijectivity implies global bijectivity. Consequently, (A3) guarantees also the global bijectivity of T_{qP}.

Summarizing these arguments, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 2.6. *The functional κ defining the quasi-Poincaré compactificaton T_{qP} satisfies the following properties.*

1. *T_{qP} is a bijection from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathcal{D} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid p(x) < 1\}$.*
2. *We have*

   (A0) *$\kappa(y) > p(y)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

   (A1) *$\kappa(y) \sim p(y)$ as $p(y) \to \infty$,*

   (A2) *$\nabla\kappa(y) = ((\nabla\kappa(y))_1, \cdots, (\nabla\kappa(y))_n)$ satisfies*

   $$(\nabla\kappa(y))_i \sim \frac{1}{\alpha_i}\frac{y_i^{2\beta_i-1}}{p(y)^{2c-1}} \quad \text{as } p(y) \to \infty.$$

   (A3) *Letting $y_\alpha = (\alpha_1 y_1, \cdots, \alpha_n y_n)^T$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\langle y_\alpha, \nabla\kappa\rangle = p(y) < \kappa(y)$ holds for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

3. *$T_{qP}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is extended continuously onto $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$.*

Proof. 1. See discussions above.

2. (A0) and (A1) follow from the definition. (A2) follows from direct calculations of $\nabla\kappa$ and (A1). (A3) follows from direct computations.

3. For any sequences $\{y_k\}_{k\ge1}$ which tend to infinity in the direction x_*, the definition $\lim_{k\to\infty} T_{qP}(y_k) \equiv x_*$ makes sense and shows the continuous extension of $T_{qP}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ onto $\mathcal{D}\cup\{x_*\}$, since $x_k \equiv T_{qP}(y_k) \to x_*$ and $p(y_k) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$; namely, $p(x_*) = 1$ and $x_* \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$. Since each $x_* \in \partial\mathcal{D}$ is an accumulation point, there is a sequence $\{x_j = (x_{ij})^T\}_{j\ge1}$ converging to x_*. Letting $y_j \equiv (y_{ij})^T$ with $y_{ij} = \kappa^{\alpha_i}x_{ij}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, for such a sequence, $\{y_j\}_{j\ge1}$ tends to infinity in the direction x_*. This fact shows that $T_{qP}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is extended continuously onto $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ and completes the proof. □

Remark 2.7. Four properties (A0) ∼ (A3) in Proposition 2.6 will play central roles in the theory of, which will be called, *quasi-homogeneous compactifications* and associated dynamics. Indeed, in the case of *homogeneous* compactifications, namely $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_n = \beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_n = 1$, these conditions describe *admissibility* of compactifications [5], which play central roles to dynamics at infinity. The (homogeneous) Poincaré compactification (e.g., [7, 15]) is the prototype of other admissible compacifications such as parabolic ones (e.g., [5, 23]), and hence quasi-Poincaré compactifications with Proposition 2.6 will be the prototype of compactifications with quasi-homogeneous desingularizations.

2.3 Geometric aspect of quasi-Poincaré compactifications

As the homogeneous version, quasi-Poincaré compactifications have the following geometric aspect. First, regard the original phase space $\mathbb{R}^n$ as the subspace $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{1\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. For any points $M = (y, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \{1\}$, there is one-to-one correspondence between M and the point on the quasi-hemisphere

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha = \{(x, \zeta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \zeta > 0,\ p(x)^{2c} + \zeta^{2c} = 1\},$$

as the intersection of $\mathcal{H}$ and the curve

$$C_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \quad C_\alpha(y, \zeta) = (\zeta^{\alpha_1} y_1, \cdots, \zeta^{\alpha_n} y_n, \zeta) \tag{2.3}$$

with endpoints $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and M. The intersection is given by the point $C_\alpha(y, \zeta)$ on the curve C_α satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\zeta^{\alpha_i} y_i)^{2\beta_i} + \zeta^{2c} = \zeta^{2c} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^{2\beta_i} + 1 \right) = 1.$$

The explicit representation of the point is

$$x = (\zeta^{\alpha_1} y_1, \cdots, \zeta^{\alpha_n} y_n) \equiv \left(\frac{y_1}{\kappa(y)^{\alpha_1}}, \cdots, \frac{y_n}{\kappa(y)^{\alpha_n}} \right), \quad \zeta = \frac{1}{(1 + p(y)^{2c})^{1/2c}} \equiv \frac{1}{\kappa(y)}.$$

The quasi-Poincaré compactification T_{qP} is thus given by the projection of the above intersection point onto $\mathbb{R}^n$. This geometric representation of T_{qP} gives its bijectivity stated in Proposition 2.6.

Remark 2.8. In the case of (homogeneous) Poincaré and other admissible, homogeneous compactifications ([5, 7, 15]), the curve C_α is given by the line segment with endpoints $(0, 0), (y, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. See Figure 1.

3 Compactifications and dynamics at infinity

In this section, we calculate the vector field (2.1) after the quasi-Poincaré compactification T_{qP}. Integers $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and c in the definition of T_{qP} are assumed to satisfy (2.2). Differentiating $x = T_{qP}(y)$ with respect to t we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_i' &= \left(\frac{y_i}{\kappa^{\alpha_i}} \right)' = \frac{y_i'}{\kappa^{\alpha_i}} - \frac{\alpha_i y_i \kappa^{\alpha_i - 1}}{\kappa^{2\alpha_i}} \kappa' \\ &= \frac{y_i'}{\kappa^{\alpha_i}} - \frac{\alpha_i y_i}{\kappa^{\alpha_i + 1}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\beta_j}{c\kappa^{2c-1}} y_j^{2\beta_j - 1} y_j' \right) = \frac{f_i(y)}{\kappa^{\alpha_i}} - \frac{\alpha_i y_i}{\kappa^{\alpha_i + 2c}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j y_j^{2\beta_j - 1} f_j(y) \right), \end{aligned}$$

Namely,

$$x' = A_\alpha \left(f_i(y) - \kappa^{-1} \langle f, \nabla \kappa \rangle y_\alpha \right) \tag{3.1}$$

We have the one-to-one correspondence of *bounded* equilibria, which helps us with detecting dynamics at infinity.



Figure 1: Poincaré and quasi-Poincaré compactifications with type $(2,1)$
Both figures describe the slice $\{y_2 = 0\}$ *of surfaces (a) :* $\mathcal{H} = \{(y_1, y_2, \zeta) \mid \zeta > 0,\ y_1^2 + y_2^2 + \zeta^2 = 1\}$, *and (b) :* $\mathcal{H}_\alpha = \{(y_1, y_2, \zeta) \mid \zeta > 0,\ y_1^2 + y_2^4 + \zeta^4 = 1\}$.
(a) : Poincaré compactification.
(b) : Quasi-Poincaré compactification with type $(2,1)$.
In both figures, the black curves describe the original phase space $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ *(straight line) and the quasi-hemispheres* H_α *(curve). In the case of (a), the type* α *is chosen to be* $(1,1)$. *Blue round points show the points in the original phase space and squared points show the intersection between* H_α *and the curve* C_α *defined by (2.3) colored by red. The projection of squared points onto the original phase space (black straight line) are the images of (quasi-)Poincaré compactifications.*

Proposition 3.1. *The quasi-Poincaré compactification T_{qP} maps bounded equilibria of (2.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n$ into equilibria of (3.1) in $\mathcal{D}$, and vice versa.*

Proof. Suppose that y_* is an equilibrium of (2.1), i.e., $f(y_*) = 0$. Then the right-hand side of (3.1) obviously vanishes at the corresponding x_*.

Conversely, suppose that the right-hand side of (3.1) vanishes at a point $x \in \mathcal{D}, p(x) < 1$: namely,

$$f(\kappa x) - \kappa(y)^{-1}\langle \nabla\kappa, f(\kappa x)\rangle y_\alpha = 0.$$

Multiplying $\nabla\kappa$, we have

$$\langle \nabla\kappa, f(\kappa x)\rangle \left(1 - \kappa(y)^{-1}\langle \nabla\kappa, y_\alpha\rangle\right) = 0.$$

Due to (A3) in Proposition 2.6-2, we have $|\kappa(y)^{-1}\langle \nabla\kappa, y_\alpha\rangle| < 1$ and hence $\langle \nabla\kappa, f(\kappa x)\rangle = 0$. Thus we have $f(y) = f(\kappa x) = 0$ by the assumption. □

Next we discuss the dynamics at infinity. Denoting

$$\tilde{f}_j(x_1, \cdots, x_n) := \kappa^{-(k+\alpha_j)} f_j(\kappa^{\alpha_1} x_1, \cdots, \kappa^{\alpha_n} x_n), \quad j = 1, \cdots, n,$$

we have

$$x_i' = \frac{\kappa^{k+\alpha_i}\tilde{f}_i(x)}{\kappa^{\alpha_i}} - \frac{\kappa^{\alpha_i} x_i}{\beta_i \kappa^{\alpha_i + 2c}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j (\kappa^{\alpha_j} x_j)^{2\beta_j - 1} \kappa^{k+\alpha_j} \tilde{f}_j(x) \right). \tag{3.2}$$

Since $\kappa \to \infty$ as $p \to 1$, then the vector field has singularities at infinity, while $\tilde{f}_j(x)$ themselves are continuous on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$. Nevertheless, the definition of quasi-Poincaré compactification yields the following observation.

Lemma 3.2. *The right-hand side of (3.2) is $O(\kappa^k)$ as $\kappa \to \infty$. In other words, the order with respect to κ is independent of i.*

Proof. By definition $\tilde{f}_i$ is $O(1)$ as $\kappa \to \infty$, and hence the first term in the right-hand side of (3.2) is $O(\kappa^k)$. Check the second term. Direct calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\kappa^{\alpha_i} x_i}{\beta_i \kappa^{\alpha_i + 2c}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j (\kappa^{\alpha_j} x_j)^{2\beta_j - 1} \kappa^{k+\alpha_j} \tilde{f}_j(x) \right) &= \frac{x_i}{\beta_i \kappa^{2c}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \kappa^{\alpha_j(2\beta_j - 1) + k + \alpha_j} x_j^{2\beta_j - 1} \tilde{f}_j(x) \right) \\
&= \frac{x_i}{\beta_i \kappa^{2c}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \kappa^{2\alpha_j\beta_j + k} x_j^{2\beta_j - 1} \tilde{f}_j(x) \right) \\
&= \frac{x_i \kappa^k}{\beta_i} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j - 1} \tilde{f}_j(x) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the condition $\alpha_j\beta_j \equiv c$ for all j from (2.2). Since $\tilde{f}_i$ is $O(1)$ as $\kappa \to \infty$, then the second term in the right-hand side of (3.2) is $O(\kappa^k)$ as $\kappa \to \infty$. Summarizing our observations, the right-hand side of (3.2) is $O(\kappa^k)$ as $\kappa \to \infty$. □

Lemma 3.2 leads to introduce the following transformation of time variable.

Definition 3.3 (Time-variable desingularization)**.** *Define the new time variable τ depending on y by*

$$d\tau = \kappa(y(t))^k dt \tag{3.3}$$

namely,

$$t - t_0 = \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} \frac{d\tau}{\kappa(y(\tau))^k},$$

where τ_0 and t_0 denote the correspondence of initial times, and $y(\tau)$ is the solution trajectory $y(t)$ under the parameter τ. We shall call (3.3) the desingularization of (3.2) of order $k+1$.

$$\dot{x}_i \equiv \frac{dx_i}{d\tau} = \tilde{f}_i - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j - 1} \tilde{f}_j \right) \frac{x_i}{\beta_i} = \tilde{f}_i - \alpha_i \kappa^{\alpha_i - 1} \langle \nabla \kappa, \tilde{f} \rangle x_i \equiv g_i(x). \tag{3.4}$$

Summarizing the above observation, we have the extension of dynamics at infinity.

Proposition 3.4 (Extension of dynamics at infinity)**.** *Let τ be the new time variable given by (3.3). Then the dynamics (2.1) can be extended to the infinity in the sense that the vector field g is continuous on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$.*

Proof. The component-wise desingularized vector field (3.4) is obviously continuous on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ since this consists of product and sum of continuous functions x_i's and $\tilde{f}_i$'s on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$. □

Proposition 3.4 shows that the dynamics and invariant sets at infinity make sense. For example, "*equilibria at infinity*" defined below are well-defined.

Definition 3.5 (Critical points at infinity)**.** We say that the vector field (2.1) has a *critical point at infinity* in the direction x_* if x_* is an equilibrium of (3.4) on $\partial\mathcal{D}$.

By using critical points at infinity, blow-up and grow-up solutions are described in terms of asymptotic behavior for desingularized vector fields.

Theorem 3.6 (Blow-up, grow-up solutions and asymptotic behavior)**.** *Let $y(t)$ be a solution of (2.1) with the interval of maximal existence time (a, b), possibly $a = -\infty$ and $b = +\infty$. Assume that y tends to infinity in the direction x_* as $t \to b - 0$ or $t \to a + 0$. Then x_* is an equilibrium of (3.4) on $\partial\mathcal{D}$.*

Proof. The property $b = \sup\{t \mid y(t) \text{ is a solution of (2.1)}\}$ corresponds to the property that

$$\sup\{\tau \mid x(\tau) = T(y(t)) \text{ is a solution of (3.4) in the time variable } \tau\} = \infty.$$

Indeed, if not, then $\tau \to \tau_0 < \infty$ and $\lim_{\tau \to \tau_0 - 0} x(\tau) = x_*$ as $t \to b - 0$. The condition $x(\tau) = x_*$ is the regular initial condition of (3.4). The vector field (3.4) with the new initial point $x(\tau) = x_*$ thus has a locally unique solution $x(\tau)$ in a neighborhood of τ_0, which contradicts the maximality of b. Therefore we know that $\tau \to +\infty$ as $t \to b - 0$. Since $\lim_{\tau \to \infty} x(\tau) = x_*$, then x_* is an equilibrium of (3.4) on $\partial\mathcal{D}$. The similar arguments show that $t \to a + 0$ corresponds to $\tau \to -\infty$ and that the same consequence holds true. □

This theorem shows that divergent solutions in the direction x_* correspond to trajectories of (3.4) on the stable manifold $W^s(x_*)$ of the equilibrium x_*. This correspondence opens the door to applications of various results in dynamical systems to divergent solutions. Before moving to the next section, we gather several properties of dynamics at infinity, which will be useful to concrete studies.

Theorem 3.7 (Dynamics at infinity)**.** *1. The boundary $\mathcal{E} = \partial\mathcal{D}$ is an invariant manifold of (3.4).*

2. Dynamics of (3.4) on $\mathcal{E}$ is dominated by

$$\dot{x}_i = (\tilde{f}_{\alpha,k})_i - \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j x^{2\beta_j-1}(\tilde{f}_{\alpha,k})_j\right)\frac{x_i}{\beta_i}.$$

3. Time evolution of $1-p(x)^{2c}$ in τ-time scale is dominated by

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}(1-p(x)^{2c}) = -\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j-1}\tilde{f}_j\right)(1-p(x)^{2c}).$$

4. Assume that the vector field f in (2.1) is quasi-homogeneous of type $(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n)$ and order $k+1$. Then the desingularized vector field g given in (3.4) satisfies

$$g_i((-1)^{\alpha_1}x_1,\cdots,(-1)^{\alpha_n}x_n) = (-1)^{k+\alpha_n}g_i(x_1,\cdots,x_n). \tag{3.5}$$

In particular, for any asymptotically quasi-homogeneous vector field f in (2.1) of type $(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n)$ and order $k+1$, the desingularized vector field g satisfies (3.5) on $\mathcal{E}$.

Proof. 1. We prove that $\frac{d}{d\tau}p(x)^{2c} = 0$ on $\mathcal{E} = \{x\in\mathbb{R}^n \mid p(x)=1\}$. Direct calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{d\tau}p(x)^{2c} &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{d\tau}\left(\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{2\beta_j}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j-1}\frac{dx_j}{d\tau}\\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j-1}\left\{\tilde{f}_j - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i x_i^{2\beta_i-1}\tilde{f}_i\right)\frac{x_j}{\beta_j}\right\}\\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j-1}\tilde{f}_j - \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{2\beta_j}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i x_i^{2\beta_i-1}\tilde{f}_i\right)\\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j-1}\tilde{f}_j - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i x_i^{2\beta_i-1}\tilde{f}_i\right) = 0 \quad \text{since } p(x)=1.
\end{aligned}$$

2. It immediately follows from

$$\lim_{p(x)\to 1}\tilde{f}(x) = \tilde{f}_{\alpha,k}$$

by the asymptotic quasi-homogeneity of f.

3. It immediately follows from calculations in the proof of statement 1.

4. First observe that $\kappa((-1)^{\alpha_1}x_1,\cdots,(-1)^{\alpha_n}x_n)=\kappa(x_1,\cdots,x_n)$. Second, for all i, the function $\tilde{f}_i$ is quasi-homogeneous of type $(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n)$ and order $k+\alpha_i$ by definition. Then, for each i, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g_i((-1)^{\alpha_1}x_1,\cdots,(-1)^{\alpha_n}x_n) &= \tilde{f}_i((-1)^{\alpha_1}x_1,\cdots,(-1)^{\alpha_n}x_n)\\
&\quad-\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\beta_j((-1)^{\alpha_j}x_j)^{2\beta_j-1}\tilde{f}_j((-1)^{\alpha_1}x_1,\cdots,(-1)^{\alpha_n}x_n)\right)\frac{(-1)^{\alpha_i}x_i}{\beta_i}\\
&=(-1)^{k+\alpha_i}\tilde{f}_i-(-1)^{\alpha_i}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}(-1)^{\alpha_j}\beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j-1}(-1)^{k+\alpha_j}\tilde{f}_j\right)\frac{x_i}{\beta_i}\\
&=(-1)^{k+\alpha_i}\tilde{f}_i-(-1)^{k+\alpha_i}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j-1}\tilde{f}_j\right)\frac{x_i}{\beta_i}\\
&=(-1)^{k+\alpha_i}g_i(x_1,\cdots,x_n)
\end{aligned}$$

and complete the proof. □

Remark 3.8. Theorem 3.7-4 shows that the vector field at infinity is equivariant with respect to the symmetry $\iota_\alpha(x)$ defined as

$$(x_1,\cdots,x_n)\mapsto\iota_\alpha(x)\equiv((-1)^{\alpha_1}x_1,\cdots,(-1)^{\alpha_n}x_n).$$

on $\mathcal{E}$. In particular, if $x\in\mathcal{E}$ is an equilibrium of (3.4), then so is $\iota_\alpha(x)$. In the homogeneous case, the symmetry is just $\iota_\alpha(x)=-x$, as stated in Proposition 2.6 of [5].

4 Blow-up solutions and blow-up rates

Theorem 3.6 indicates that divergent solutions are described as trajectories on stable manifolds of critical points at infinity for (3.4). On the other hand, Theorem 3.6 itself does not distinguish blow-up solutions from grow-up solutions. Under additional assumptions to critical points at infinity, we can characterize blow-up solutions from the viewpoint of dynamical systems. In this section, we give a criterion of blow-up which is sufficient to apply in Section 5.

Blow-up criterion with ordinary compactification is discussed in [5]. Roughly speaking, preceding results stated there claim that *linearly stable critical points at infinity induce blow-up solutions.* In general, however, as shown in Section 5, critical points at infinity may admit unstable directions; namely, the Jacobian matrix Jg of (3.4) at those points may admit eigenvalues with positive real parts. Global trajectories asymptotic to such critical points at infinity will be referred to as *unstable grow-up or blow-up solutions.* The following theorem is one of our main results, which gives a criterion of blow-ups not only for stable but also unstable blow-up solutions.

Theorem 4.1 (Blow-up solutions and blow-up rates)**.** *Assume that (2.1) has a critical point at infinity in the direction x_*. Suppose that the desingularized vector field g in (3.4) is C^1 on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$, and that all eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$ of the Jacobian matrix $Jg(x_*)$ at x_* have nonzero real parts satisfying*

$$\mathrm{Re}\lambda^s_{n_s} \le \mathrm{Re}\lambda^s_{n_s-1} \le \cdots \le \mathrm{Re}\lambda^s_1 < 0 < \mathrm{Re}\lambda^u_1 \le \mathrm{Re}\lambda^u_2 \le \cdots \le \mathrm{Re}\lambda^u_{n_u}, \quad n_s + n_u = n, \tag{4.1}$$

possibly with the case n_u or n_s is equal to zero. Further suppose that eigenvalues possess no resonance; namely, for all $j = 1, \cdots, n$, $\lambda_j \neq \sum_{i=1}^n m_i\lambda_i$ holds true for any $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{Z}^n_{\ge 0}$[2]. Then the solution $y(t)$ of (2.1) whose image $x = T_{qP}(y)$ is on $W^s(x_*)$ in the desingularized vector field (3.4) satisfies $t_{\max} < \infty$; namely, $y(t)$ is a blow-up solution. Moreover,

$$p(y(t)) \sim c(t_{\max} - t)^{-1/k} \quad \text{as} \quad t \to t_{\max},$$

where $k+1$ is the order of asymptotically quasi-homogeneous vector field f. Finally, if the i-th component $(x_*)_i$ of x_* is not zero, then we also have

$$y_i(t) \sim c(t_{\max} - t)^{-\alpha_i/k} \quad \text{as} \quad t \to t_{\max}.$$

Proof. First note that g as well as the generated flow is assumed to be C^1 on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$, which indicates that the vector fields has an extension into a neighborhood of $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We can choose an open neighborhood U of x_* and a C^1-change of coordinate $h : (z^u, z^s) \mapsto x$ in U such that $h(0) = x_* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and that (3.4) in U is mapped into

$$\begin{aligned} &\dot{z}^u = \Lambda^u z^u, \quad \dot{z}^s = \Lambda^s z^s, \\ &\Lambda^u = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda^u_1, \lambda^u_2, \cdots \lambda^u_{n_u}), \quad \Lambda^s = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda^s_1, \lambda^s_2, \cdots \lambda^s_{n_s}), \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

by Hartman-Grobman's Theorem. Note that, if $\{\lambda^u_i\}_{i=1}^{n_u}$ and/or $\{\lambda^u_i\}_{i=1}^{n_u}$ contain complex conjugate eigenvalues, say λ^u_i and $\lambda^u_{i+1} = \overline{\lambda^u_i}$, then the corresponding diagonal part $\mathrm{diag}(\lambda^u_i, \lambda^u_{i+1})$ of Λ^u is replaced by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Re}\lambda^u_i & -\mathrm{Im}\lambda^u_i \\ \mathrm{Im}\lambda^u_i & \mathrm{Re}\lambda^u_i \end{pmatrix}.$$

A similar replacement is operated to Λ^s. All arguments below do not change under these replacements.

Our focus here is the stable manifold $W^s(x_*)$ of x_*, which is transformed via the conjugacy h into $\{z^u = 0\} \cap h(U)$. Solutions on the stable manifold $W^s(x_*) = W^s(h(0))$ are thus written by

$$z^u = 0, \quad z^s(\tau) = e^{\Lambda^s \tau} z^s_0,$$

in the z-coordinate, where $(0, z^s_0)$ is an initial position of solution, which may be assumed to be in $h(U)$. The above expression is valid due to the non-resonance condition of eigenvalues. Consequently, we have

$$z(\tau) = c_1 e^{\mathrm{Re}\lambda^s_1 \tau}(\mathbf{1} + o(\mathbf{1})) \quad \text{as } \tau \to \infty$$

with some constant c_1, where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \cdots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and hence, thanks to the C^1-conjugacy $h = id + v$ with bounded continuous function v,

$$x(\tau) - x_* = h(z(\tau)) = c_2 e^{-m\tau}(\mathbf{1} + o(\mathbf{1})) \quad \text{as } \tau \to \infty$$

[2] In particular, there is no equalities in (4.1) except complex conjugate pairs.

with $-m \le \mathrm{Re}\lambda_1^s < 0$ and some constant c_2.

Turn to the quantity $1 - p^{2c}(x(\tau))$. Near x_* with $p(x_*) = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - p^{2c}(x(\tau)) &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - (x_*)_i + (x_*)_i)^{2\beta_i} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{k_i=1}^{2\beta_i} {}_{2\beta_i}C_{k_i}(x_*)_i^{2\beta_i - k_i}(x_i - (x_*)_i)^{k_i} \\ &= c_3 e^{-\ell\tau}(1 + o(1)) \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

for some $-\ell \le -m < 0$, where the terms 1 and $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_*)_i^{2\beta_i}$ are cancelled out. Recall that we have for a certain initial point t_0,

$$\begin{aligned} t - t_0 &= \int_0^\tau \frac{d\eta}{\kappa(y(\eta))^k} \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{d\eta}{\kappa(y(\eta))^k} - \int_\tau^\infty \frac{d\eta}{\kappa(y(\eta))^k} \end{aligned}$$

and the integrals converge due to (4.3)[3]. In particular, $t_{\max} < \infty$ holds and the solution is a blow-up solution. Thus

$$t_{\max} - t = \int_\tau^\infty \frac{d\eta}{\kappa(y(\eta))^k} = c_4 e^{-(k\ell/2c)\tau}(1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } \tau \to \infty.$$

Since $dt/d\tau > 0$, this relation is then solvable for τ and, together with (4.3), it yields that

$$1 - p^{2c}(x(\tau)) \sim c_5(t_{\max} - t)^{2c/k}$$

and

$$p(y(t)) = p(x(t))\kappa(x(t)) = \frac{p(x(t))}{(1 - p(x(t))^{2c})^{1/2c}} \sim c(t_{\max} - t)^{-1/k}$$

as $t \to t_{\max}$, where c_3, c_4, c_5 and c are certain constants.

It immediately follows from the above asymptotics that, for y_i tending to x_* with $(x_*)_i \neq 0$,

$$y_i(t) = \kappa(y(t))^{\alpha_i}x_i(t) \sim p(y(t))^{\alpha_i}x_i(t) \sim c(t_{\max} - t)^{-\alpha_i/k} \quad \text{as } t \to t_{\max}.$$

□

Theorem 4.1 generalizes the result in [5] in the sense that the blow-up criteria are valid even for quasi-Poincaré compactifications, and that the blow-up behavior is characterized by not only stable equilibria on $\partial\mathcal{D}$, but also hyperbolic ones. We then have the slogan: *hyperbolic critical points at infinity induce blow-up solutions.*

Note that the blow-up rate of each component reflects the type α of asymptotically quasi-homogeneous vector field f, unlike preceding compactifications. In Section 5, we observe various blow-up solutions in concrete systems, some of which involve critical points at infinity of saddle type. Such "unstable" blow-up solutions are expected to be the trigger of other singular nature in systems like singular shock profiles.

[3] This estimate holds only for trajectories corresponding to those on the stable manifold of x_*.

Remark 4.2. In Theorem 4.1, we assumed the C^1 smoothness of the desingularized vector field g on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$. In fact, the vector field g may lose its smoothness on $\partial\mathcal{D}$, even if f is arbitrarily smooth. It is because of the presence of radicals in (quasi-)Poincaré compactifications. If f is a polynomial vector field $f(y) = (f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y))$ with

$$f_j(y) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_j} \sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_n \geq 0, i_1+\cdots+i_n=i} a_{ji_1\cdots i_n} y_i^{i_1} \cdots y_n^{i_n}, \quad a_{ji_1\cdots i_n} \neq 0 \text{ for some } i_1, \cdots, i_n \text{ with } \sum_{l=1}^{n} i_l = k_j, \tag{4.4}$$

the loss of smoothness of g may occur. Indeed, the form of $\tilde{f}$ indicate that the desingularized vector field g_i may contain $\kappa^{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$. A direct calculation yields

$$\frac{\partial \kappa^{-\gamma}}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{2\beta_i}\right)^{\gamma/2c} = -\frac{2\beta_j\gamma}{2c}\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{2\beta_i}\right)^{(\gamma-2c)/2c} x_j^{2\beta_j-1},$$

which is singular on $\mathcal{E}$ if $\gamma - 2c < 0$. In the case of polynomial vector fields, we have a rough sufficient condition for C^1-extension of g on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$, which is stated in Lemma 4.3. In Section 5, we see examples of vector fields admitting C^1-extendable desingularized vector field, and non-C^1-extendable one.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $f = (f_1, \cdots, f_n)$ be an asymptotically quasi-homogeneous polynomial vector field of type α and order $k+1$ given in (4.4). Suppose that*

$$a_{ji_1\cdots i_n} = 0 \text{ for all } i_1, \cdots, i_n \text{ with } \sum_{l=1}^{n} \alpha_{i_l} \in \{k + \alpha_j - \gamma \mid \gamma = 1, \cdots, 2c-1\} \tag{4.5}$$

holds for all $j = 1, \cdots, n$. Then the desingularized vector field g in (3.4) is C^1 on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$.

Proof. Recall that $g_i = \tilde{f}_i - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j x_j^{2\beta_j-1} \tilde{f}_j\right) \frac{x_i}{\beta_i}$. The vector field g_i is C^1 on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ if, at least, all $\tilde{f}_j$ are C^1 on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{f}_j(x_1, \cdots, x_n) &= \kappa^{-(k+\alpha_j)} f_j(\alpha_1 x_1, \cdots, \alpha_n x_n) \\ &= \kappa^{-(k+\alpha_j)} \sum_{i=0}^{k_j} \sum_{i_1,\cdots,i_n \geq 0, i_1+\cdots+i_n=i} a_{ji_1\cdots i_n} \kappa^{\alpha_{i_1}+\cdots+\alpha_{i_n}} x_i^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n}.\end{aligned}$$

From the asymptotical quasi-homogeneity of f, $\sum_{l=1}^{n} \alpha_{i_l} \leq k + \alpha_j$. Therefore the κ-term in each summand has the form

$$\kappa^{\sum_{l=1}^{n} \alpha_{i_l} - (k+\alpha_j)} = \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{2\beta_i}\right)^{(\sum_{l=1}^{n} \alpha_{i_l} - (k+\alpha_j))/2c}$$

Arguments in Remark 4.2 show that the above term is C^1 on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ if either $\sum_{l=1}^{n} \alpha_{i_l} = k + \alpha_j$ or $(k + \alpha_j) - \sum_{l=1}^{n} \alpha_{i_l} \geq 2c$ holds for all j. Consequently, $\tilde{f}_j$ is C^1 on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ if (4.5) holds for all j, and so is g, which completes the proof. □

5 Applications and discussions : singular shock waves

In this section, we apply quasi-Poincaré compactification to concrete systems for demonstrating the applicability. We consider the following ODEs:

$$\begin{cases} u' = u^2 - v, \\ v' = \frac{1}{3}u^3 \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u' = u^2 - v - su - c_1, \\ v' = \frac{1}{3}u^3 - u - sv - c_2, \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

where $(c_1, c_2) = (c_{1L}, c_{2L})$ or (c_{1R}, c_{2R}) with

$$\begin{cases} c_{1L} = u_L^2 - v_L - su_L, \\ c_{2L} = \frac{1}{3}u_L^3 - u_L - sv_L, \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} c_{1R} = u_R^2 - su_R - v_R, \\ c_{2R} = \frac{1}{3}u_R^3 - u_R - sv_R. \end{cases}$$

The system (5.2) is well-known as the traveling wave equation derived from the *Keyfitz-Kranser model* [12, 10], which is the following initial value problem of the system of conversation laws:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}(u^2 - v) = 0, \\ \dfrac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\dfrac{1}{3}u^3 - u\right) = 0, \end{cases} \qquad (u(x,0), v(x,0)) = \begin{cases} (u_L, v_L) & x < 0, \\ (u_R, v_R) & x > 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

(5.1) is exploited the quasi-homogeneous part, as shown below, from (5.2). The aim of this section is to discuss the application of quasi-Poincaré compactifications to (5.1) and (5.2) for observing blow-up solutions and related singularity aspect of solutions with the help of numerical simulations. We see that quasi-Poincaré compactifications give us comprehensive observations of blow-up solutions as well as singular solutions as a sequence of blow-up solutions and trajectories at infinity.

5.1 Preliminaries

Before starting our discussions, we briefly review concepts about (5.2) concerning with singular shock waves in [17], which are our main targets in this section.

5.1.1 Singular shocks

Consider the system of n-tuple conservation laws

$$U_t + F(U)_x \equiv U_t + A(U)U_x = 0, \quad (x,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty) \tag{5.4}$$

such that all eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i(U)\}_{i=1}^n$ of $A(U)$ are real for all $U \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Without the loss of generality, we label eigenvalues so that $\lambda_1(U) \leq \lambda_2(U) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n(U)$ holds for all U under consideration[4].

[4] In this statement, all eigenvalues are assumed to be real, which is essential for studying (5.4). In many cases, we further assume that these eigenvalues are strictly distinct for all U in a domain of consideration $N \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, in which case the system (5.4) is called *strictly hyperbolic*. It is the case of our considerations in the current argument.

In many problems the initial value problem with the data

$$U(x,0) = \begin{cases} U_L & x < 0, \\ U_R & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

are considered, which is called the *Riemann problem* of (5.4). (5.3) is nothing but a Riemann problem of Keyfitz-Kranser model. One of main aims of Riemann problems is to study solutions with special form in the class of weak solutions, called *Riemann solutions* consisting of a finite number of constant states, *shock waves* (jump discontinuities) and *rarefaction waves* (integral curves of right eigenvectors of $A(U)$) under the genuine nonlinearity of characteristic fields (i.e., $\{\lambda_i(U)\}$). Such solutions come from gas dynamics equations and hence they are often called *classical* solutions of Riemann problems. See e.g., [21] about the classical theory of conservation laws.

On the other hand, a "solution" which is not even a weak solution of (5.4) was observed in the above standard settings, say [12], which is called a *singular shock wave*. See e.g., [9] for retrospectives of such a singular solution. Now a singular shock wave is characterized as follows.

Definition 5.1 (Singular shock wave, [9])**.** A *singular shock wave solution* of (5.4) is a measure of the form

$$U(x,t) = \tilde{U}(x,t) + \sum_i M_i(t)\chi_{I_i}(t)\delta(x - x_i(t)),$$

where $\tilde{U}$ is a weak solution of (5.4) in the complement of $\bigcup x_i(t)$; the curve segments $\{x_i\}$ supporting the singularities are $W^{1,\infty}$ functions defined on time intervals I_i; and the singular masses M_i are L^∞ (vector-valued) functions. In addition, U is the limit of approximations U^ϵ satisfying

1. $U^\epsilon \in L^1_{loc}$, uniformly in ϵ, pointwise in t,
2. $U^\epsilon \rightharpoonup U$ as $\epsilon \to 0$ weakly in the space of measures on $\mathbb{R}$, pointwise in t,
3. for some positive definite matrix A, we have

$$U^\epsilon_t(\cdot,t) + F(U^\epsilon(\cdot,t))_x - \epsilon(AU^\epsilon_x(\cdot,t))_x \rightharpoonup 0$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$ weakly in the space of measures on $\mathbb{R}$, pointwise in t.

One of fundamental properties of singular shocks other than Dirac delta singularity is the presence of *Rankine-Hugoniot deficit*, namely, for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$ representing the shock speed,

$$[u^2] - [v] = s[u], \quad C := s[v] - \left(\frac{1}{3}[u^3] - [u]\right) > 0, \tag{5.5}$$

where $[f(u)] = f(u_L) - f(u_R)$ is the jump of functions at discontinuity. The positive number C is often referred to as the *Rankine-Hugoniot deficit* of (5.2). If C in (5.5) is calculated to be zero, then the system (5.3) is said to satisfy the *Rankine-Hugoniot condition*, which is a necessary condition so that any weak solutions of (5.3) in the ordinary sense should be satisfied at discontinuity[5]. In other words, singular shocks cannot be characterized as weak solutions of (5.3). Singular shock waves are often considered with the following admissibility condition. We only pay attention to admissible singular shocks in the current discussion.

[5] According to this well-known condition, the condition (5.5) is sometimes said *the generalized Rankine-Hugoniot condition*.

Definition 5.2 (Admissible singular shocks, cf. [10, 11, 17])**.** A singular shock with the left state $U_L = (u_L, v_L)^T$, the right state $U_R = (u_R, v_R)^T$ and the speed s for (5.3) is called *admissible* if

$$\lambda_2(U_L) > \lambda_1(U_L) \geq s \geq \lambda_2(U_R) > \lambda_1(U_R)$$

holds. In other words, the wave is said to be *overcompressive*

5.1.2 Viscous and Dafermos profiles of singular shocks

A classical approach for detecting singular shocks is to add *viscous terms* to (5.2). There are mainly two approaches for detecting the limiting profile of shock waves as well as singular shock waves. One is the *viscous regularization* given by

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}(u^2 - v) = \epsilon u_{xx}, \\ \dfrac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\dfrac{1}{3}u^3 - u\right) = \epsilon v_{xx}. \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

A typical approach with the assistance of (5.6) is to study self-similar solutions of (5.6) which converge to singular shocks away from shock discontinuities, and become unbounded near discontinuities as $\epsilon \to 0$. In [17], singular shocks are constructed by asymptotic analysis; namely, constructions of outer solutions and inner solutions which match near discontinuities.

Here "outer solutions" are characterized by two *blow-up solutions* of viscous profile equation, which is exactly (5.2) with corresponding constants (c_1, c_2). On the other hand, "inner solutions" correspond to *bounded solutions* of a differential equation which has the same form as (5.1), while the terminology "bounded" measures near infinity in arguments of [17][6].

Another approach is the *Dafermos* or *Dafermos-DiPerna regularization* given by

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}(u^2 - v) = \epsilon t u_{xx}, \\ \dfrac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\dfrac{1}{3}u^3 - u\right) = \epsilon t v_{xx}. \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

Although this regularization does not have any physical meanings, the equation preserves the scaling $x \mapsto \lambda x$ and $t \mapsto \lambda t$, and hence it is very useful to study self-similar solutions of the form $U(x,t) = \phi(x/t)$. In e.g., [12, 10], the Dafermos regularization (5.7) is studied to prove the convergence of solutions (*Dafermos profiles*) to singular limits, namely singular shocks. In [18], the convergence of Dafermos profiles to singular shocks by the geometric singular perturbation theory.

Here we choose the viscous regularization approach and capture singular shock profiles from the viewpoint of blow-up solutions. In particular, we pay attention to shock waves of (5.4) satisfying the *viscosity profile criterion*, namely, traveling wave solutions $U(x,t) = \tilde{U}(x - st) \equiv \tilde{U}(\zeta)$ of (5.6) satisfying

$$\lim_{\zeta \to -\infty} \tilde{U}(\zeta) = U_L, \quad \lim_{\zeta \to +\infty} \tilde{U}(\zeta) = U_R. \tag{5.8}$$

[6] In our system (5.1), "bounded" solutions corresponds to bounded solutions in the original phase spaces, which have completely opposite meanings to [17].

Substituting $\tilde{U}(\zeta)$ into (5.6) after the scaling $\xi = \zeta/\epsilon$, we have the equation of $\tilde{U}(\xi)$ as

$$-s\tilde{U}' + (F(\tilde{U}))' = \tilde{U}'', \tag{5.9}$$

where $' = d/d\xi$. Integrating the equation we have $\tilde{U}' = F(\tilde{U}) - s\tilde{U} + C$ with a constant vector C. Matching to the boundary condition (5.8) yields

$$C = -F(U_L) + sU_L, \quad \text{or} \quad C = -F(U_R) + sU_R. \tag{5.10}$$

The system (5.2) is nothing but (5.9)-(5.10)[7] associated with the Keyfitz-Kranser model (5.3). In near future, observed singular shocks are applied to Dafermos regularization approach to characterizing their singular nature precisely.

5.2 Compactification and desingularization

Let $f(u,v) = (f_1(u,v), f_2(u,v))$ be $f_1(u,v) = u^2 - v - su - c_1$ and $f_2(u,v) = \frac{1}{3}u^3 - u - sv - c_2$. Then we immediately have the following observation.

Lemma 5.3. *The vector field f is asymptotically quasi-homogeneous of type $(1,2)$ and order 2.*

Proof. Direct computations yield

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(ru, r^2v) &= (ru)^2 - r^2v - rsu - c_1 = r^2(u^2 - v) - (rsu - c_1), \\ f_2(ru, r^2v) &= \frac{1}{3}(ru)^3 - ru - r^2sv - c_2, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-2}\left(f_1(ru, r^2v) - r^2(u^2 - v)\right) &= -(r^{-1}su + r^{-2}c_1), \\ r^{-3}\left(f_2(ru, r^2v) - \frac{1}{3}(ru)^3\right) &= -(r^{-2}u + r^{-1}sv + r^{-3}c_2), \end{aligned}$$

which converge to zero on S^1 as $|r| \to \infty$. □

Remark 5.4. The quasi-asymptotic vector field $f_{(1,2),1} = (u^2 - v, \frac{1}{3}u^3)^T$ is the normal form of (5.2) for the analysis of singular shocks (e.g., [10, 17, 18]).

We apply the quasi-Poincaré compactification of type $(1,2)$ as follows:

$$x_1 = \frac{u}{\kappa}, \quad x_2 = \frac{v}{\kappa^2}, \quad \kappa = \kappa(u,v) = (1 + u^4 + v^2)^{1/4}.$$

Note that this quasi-Poincaré compactification is exactly same as the scaling of solutions near infinity in [17].

[7] The limit of solutions of (5.9)-(5.10) under $\epsilon \to 0$ gives shock wave solutions for (5.4). Classical shocks are thus given as traveling wave solutions of (5.9) with $C = -F(U_L) + sU_L$ satisfying $F(U_L) - F(U_R) = s(U_L - U_R)$; namely, the Rankine-Hugoniot condition with speed s. In other words, classical shocks correspond to heteroclinic orbits connecting two equilibria U_L and U_R for (5.9). Singular shocks, however, cannot be characterized as such heteroclinic orbits, which can be seen as violation of the Rankine-Hugoniot condition. We thus consider both choices of C in (5.10) when we construct singular shocks.

The desingularized vector field (3.4) of order $k+1=2$ for (5.1) is

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = (x_1^2 - x_2) - \dfrac{x_1}{2}\left\{2x_1^3(x_1^2-x_2) + \dfrac{1}{3}x_1^3x_2\right\}, \\ \dot{x}_2 = \dfrac{1}{3}x_1^3 - x_2\left\{2x_1^3(x_1^2-x_2) + \dfrac{1}{3}x_1^3x_2\right\}, \end{cases} \tag{5.11}$$

while the desingularized vector field for (5.2) is

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = (x_1^2 - x_2 - \kappa^{-1}sx_1 - \kappa^{-2}c_1) - \dfrac{x_1}{2}G(x_1,x_2), \\ \dot{x}_2 = \left(\dfrac{1}{3}x_1^3 - \kappa^{-2}x_1 - \kappa^{-1}sx_2 - \kappa^{-3}c_2\right) - x_2G(x_1,x_2), \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(x_1,x_2) &= 2x_1^3(x_1^2 - x_2 - \kappa^{-1}sx_1 - \kappa^{-2}c_1) + x_2\left(\frac{1}{3}x_1^3 - \kappa^{-2}x_1 - \kappa^{-1}sx_2 - \kappa^{-3}c_2\right) \\ &= 2x_1^5 - \frac{5}{3}x_1^3x_2 - \kappa^{-1}s(2x_1^4 + x_2^2) - \kappa^{-2}(2c_1x_1^3 + x_1x_2) - \kappa^{-3}c_2x_2. \end{aligned}$$

5.3 Dynamics at infinity

Here we consider equilibria of (5.12) on $\mathcal{E} = \{p(x) = 1\}$. They should satisfy

$$\begin{cases} (x_1^2 - x_2) - \dfrac{x_1}{2}\left\{2x_1^3(x_1^2-x_2) + \dfrac{1}{3}x_1^3x_2\right\} = 0, \\ \dfrac{1}{3}x_1^3 - x_2\left\{2x_1^3(x_1^2-x_2) + \dfrac{1}{3}x_1^3x_2\right\} = 0, \\ x_1^4 + x_2^2 = 1 \quad (\Leftrightarrow\ p(x) = 1). \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

We immediately know that, if (x_1, x_2) is a critical point at infinity, then $x_1, x_2 \neq 0, \pm 1$.

We may thus divide the second equation by x_1^3 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{3} - x_2\left\{2(x_1^2 - x_2) + \frac{1}{3}x_2\right\} = 0 &\Leftrightarrow 1 - 6x_2(x_1^2 - x_2) - x_2^2 = 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow 1 = 6x_2x_1^2 - 5x_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

We thus have

$$x_1^2 = \frac{1 + 5x_2^2}{6x_2}. \tag{5.14}$$

Since $x_1^2 > 0$, x_2 has to be positive. Moreover, since $x_1^2 < 1$, then x_2 also has to satisfy $1 + 5x_2^2 < 6x_2$. Thus $\frac{1}{5} < x_2 < 1$.

The first equation of (5.13) is

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1^2 - x_2) - \frac{x_1}{2}\left\{2x_1^3(x_1^2-x_2) + \frac{1}{3}x_1^3x_2\right\} = 0 &\Leftrightarrow (x_1^2 - x_2) - x_1^4(x_1^2 - x_2) - \frac{1}{6}x_1^4x_2 = 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow x_2^2(x_1^2 - x_2) - \frac{1}{6}(1 - x_2^2)x_2 = 0 \quad (\text{by } x_1^4 + x_2^2 = 1). \end{aligned}$$

We may divide the right-most side by x_2 to obtain

$$x_2(x_1^2 - x_2) - \frac{1}{6}(1 - x_2^2) = 0 \Leftrightarrow 6x_1^2 x_2 - 1 - 5x_2^2 = 0,$$

which is exactly same as (5.14). We substitute (5.14) into $p(x) = 1$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{1+5x_2^2}{6x_2}\right)^2 + x_2^2 = 1 &\Leftrightarrow (1+5x_2^2)^2 = 36x_2^2(1-x_2^2)\\ &\Leftrightarrow 1 + 10\lambda + 25\lambda^2 = 36\lambda - 36\lambda^2 \quad (\text{setting } \lambda \equiv x_2^2)\\ &\Leftrightarrow 61\lambda^2 - 26\lambda + 1 = 0\\ &\Leftrightarrow \lambda = \frac{13 \pm 6\sqrt{3}}{61} \quad (\text{which satisfy } \lambda = x_2^2 > \frac{1}{25}).\end{aligned}$$

In this case, we have

$$x_2 = \sqrt{\frac{13+6\sqrt{3}}{61}} \approx 0.61925794892, \quad \sqrt{\frac{13-6\sqrt{3}}{61}} \approx 0.206758557 \in \left(\frac{1}{5}, 1\right),$$

as well as

$$x_1 = \pm\sqrt[4]{\frac{48-6\sqrt{3}}{61}} \approx \pm 0.88610812897, \quad \pm\sqrt[4]{\frac{48+6\sqrt{3}}{61}} \approx \pm 0.98913699589.$$

As a consequence, we obtain the following result.

Lemma 5.5. *Critical points at infinity of (5.2) associated with quasi-Poincaré compactification with type* $(1,2)$ *and order* 2 *are the following four points:*

$$p_1^{\pm} = \left(\pm\sqrt[4]{\frac{48+6\sqrt{3}}{61}}, \sqrt{\frac{13-6\sqrt{3}}{61}}\right) \quad p_2^{\pm} = \left(\pm\sqrt[4]{\frac{48-6\sqrt{3}}{61}}, \sqrt{\frac{13+6\sqrt{3}}{61}}\right).$$

Next we consider the dynamics of (5.11) on $\mathcal{E}$, which is the dynamics on a simple closed curve (namely, no self-crossing points) with four equilibria. Note that $\mathcal{E}$ is an invariant submanifold of $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ for (5.11). Dynamics on $\mathcal{E}$ behaves monotonously off four equilibria stated in Lemma 5.5. In particular, the vector field (5.11) at $(x_1, x_2) = (0, \pm 1)$ is

$$\dot{x}_1 \mid_{(x_1,x_2)=(0,\pm 1)} = \mp 1, \quad \dot{x}_2 \mid_{(x_1,x_2)=(0,\pm 1)} = 0,$$

Similarly, we have

$$\dot{x}_1 \mid_{(x_1,x_2)=(\sqrt[4]{3/4},1/2)} = \mp 1, \quad \dot{x}_2 \mid_{(x_1,x_2)=(\sqrt[4]{3/4},1)} = 0,$$

Consequently, we have the following result.

Proposition 5.6. *There are heteroclinic orbits from (i) :* p_1^- *to* p_1^+*, (ii) :* p_2^+ *to* p_1^+*, (iii)* p_2^+ *to* p_2^-*, and (iv)* p_1^- *to* p_2^-*. The closure of these orbits fulfills* $\mathcal{E}$*.*

5.4 Numerical studies of blow-up solutions

We calculate the Jacobian matrix of (5.11) at $p_i^{\pm}$. We immediately have

$$Jg(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 2x_1 - 6x_1^5 + \frac{10}{3}x_1^3x_2 & -1 + \frac{5}{6}x_1^4 \\ x_1^2 - 10x_1^4x_2 + 5x_1^2x_2^2 & -2x_1^5 + \frac{10}{3}x_1^3x_2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.15}$$

We numerically compute eigenvalues of this matrix at $p_i^{\pm}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ to obtain

- At p_1^+, $\mu_1 \approx -3.120431013481$, $\mu_2 \approx -1.142157021691$.
- At p_1^-, $\mu_1 \approx 1.142157021691$, $\mu_2 \approx 3.120431013481$.
- At p_2^+, $\mu_1 \approx -0.7490267243629$, $\mu_2 \approx 1.023189533593$.
- At p_2^-, $\mu_1 \approx -1.023189533593$, $\mu_2 \approx 0.7490267243629$.

That is, p_1^+ is a sink, p_1^- is a source, and both $p_2^{\pm}$ are saddles. Theorem 4.1 implies that trajectories asymptotic to these equilibria, which are shown in Figure 2, are blow-up solutions (in the numerical sense).



Figure 2: Global trajectories of (5.11) on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$
(a) Red : global trajectories through $x_1 = 0, x_2 > 0$. (b) Green : global trajectories through $x_1 = 0, x_2 < 0$. (c) Blue : global trajectories connecting p_1^- and the origin. (d) Purple : global trajectories connecting the origin and p_1^+.
All trajectories are computed by using standard Runge-Kutta explicit scheme, not advanced scheme for hyperbolic systems such as Godunov scheme. Trajectories (b), (c) and (d) are actually considered to be blow-up solutions, because equilibria $p_1^{\pm}$ are hyperbolic (in the numerical sense).



Figure 3: The sequence $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^3$
W_1 : a heteroclinic orbit connecting $x_L = T_{qP}(U_L) = (0.95, 0.1)$ and p_2^+. Note that x_L is a source equilibrium of (5.2) with $(c_1, c_2) = (c_{1L}, c_{2L})$. W_2 : a heteroclinic orbit connecting p_2^+ and p_2^-. W_3 : a heteroclinic orbit connecting p_2^- and $x_R = T_{qP}(U_R) = (-0.85, 0.2)$. Note that x_R is a sink equilibrium of (5.2) with $(c_1, c_2) = (c_{1R}, c_{2R})$.

5.5 Observation of singular shock profile for (5.3)

Now we move to the system (5.2). First note that we cannot directly apply arguments in Section 4 to (5.2) because (5.12) is not C^1 on $\mathcal{E}$ in general. Nevertheless, the following C^0-analysis of dynamics with observations in previous subsections provides us a new aspect of singular shocks towards rigorous analysis.

Consider (5.12) with the following Riemann data[8]:

$$U_L = (u_L, v_L) = (1.46777062491, 0.238709208571),$$
$$U_R = (u_R, v_R) = (-1.04484518909, 0.302201098731)$$

with characteristics

$$\lambda_1(U_L) = 0.467770624912, \quad \lambda_2(U_L) = 2.46777062491,$$
$$\lambda_1(U_R) = -2.04484518909, \quad \lambda_2(U_R) = -0.0448451890899.$$

Following the generalized Rankine-Hugoniot condition, set the speed s as

$$s = \frac{(u_L^2 - u_R^2) - (v_L - v_R)}{u_L - u_R} \approx 0.448194675077.$$

[8] These values are chosen as the preimage $T_{qP}^{-1}(x)$ of $x_L = (0.95, 0.1)$, and $x_R = (-0.85, 0.2)$, respectively.

A direct comparison of eigenvalues and s indicates that the wave connecting U_L from the left and U_R from the right is overcompressive.

Since $p_2^{\pm} \in \mathcal{E}$ are saddles for (5.11), we can expect that p_2^+ is stable in the direction normal to the tangent space $T_{p_2^+}\mathcal{E}$. Similarly, p_2^- is expected to be unstable in the direction normal to the tangent space $T_{p_2^-}\mathcal{E}$. With this observation in mind, we compute trajectories with initial data in $\mathcal{D}$ near $p_2^{\pm}$, which are shown in Figure 3. Note that the trajectory to p_2^+ is computed with $(c_1, c_2) = (c_{1L}, c_{2L})$ in the time-reverse flow, and that the trajectory from p_2^- is computed with $(c_1, c_2) = (c_{1R}, c_{2R})$ in the time-forward flow. We have seen in the previous subsection that (5.11) admits a heteroclinic orbit connecting p_2^+ to p_2^- on $\mathcal{E}$, which is also the one for (5.12) according to Theorem 3.7. We thus numerically observe a sequence of global trajectories $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^3$ given by

$$W_1 : T_{qP}(U_L) \to p_2^+, \quad W_2 : p_2^+ \to p_2^-, \quad W_3 : p_2^- \to T_{qP}(U_R).$$

On the other hand, a direct calculation shows

$$C = s(v_L - v_R) - \left\{ \frac{1}{3}(u_L^3 - u_R^3) - (u_L - u_R) \right\} \approx 1.04990856518,$$

which implies the existence of Rankine-Hugoniot deficit, and hence the sequence $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^3$ is expected to be an admissible singular shock. Profiles of (u, v) corresponding to the sequence is shown in Figure 4, which actually corresponding to singular shock profiles observed in [10, 17].



(a) *(b)*

Figure 4: Profiles of $(u(x,t), v(x,t)) = (\hat{u}\left(\frac{x-st}{\epsilon}\right), \hat{v}\left(\frac{x-st}{\epsilon}\right))$ *for (5.3) corresponding to* $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^3$ *(a) : Profile of* $\hat{u}(x-st)$*. (b) : Profile of* $\hat{v}(x-st)$*. Asymptotic behavior in the outer layer (namely, as* $x - st \to \mp\infty$*) corresponds to* W_1 *and* W_3*, respectively. Signatures of* u *and* v *in the inner layer (namely, near Dirac delta singularity) reflect transition of* W_2*. Remark 5.7 shows how these figures are actually drawn. These profiles transit in the positive* x *direction with the speed* $s \approx 0.448194675077$*.*

Remark 5.7. Two trajectories W_1 and W_3 correspond to outer solutions in [17], while W_2 corresponds to an inner solution in [17]. Both profiles (a) and (b) are written as the preimage $\{T_{qP}^{-1}(W_i)\}_{i=1}^3$ of the sequence $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^3$ replacing κ by an artificial modification κ_η given by

$$\kappa_\eta(x)^{-2c} = 1 + \eta - p(x)^{2c}, \quad \eta > 0,$$

so that we can easily see the singular nature of (u, v) near the support of singular shock. In (a) and (b) the smoothing parameter η is set to be 10^{-6}. By definition, profiles of (u, v) will converge to Dirac delta-like ones keeping the change of signature at the support as $\eta \to 0$.

Remark 5.8 (Comparison with [12])**.** Keyfitz and Kranzer ([12], and related works) characterize singular shocks also from the viewpoint of width of layer in waves. In [12], singular solutions are assumed to admit the following Ansatz:

$$\phi(\xi) = \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^p} \tilde{u} \left(\frac{\xi - s}{\epsilon^q} \right), \frac{1}{\epsilon^r} \tilde{v} \left(\frac{\xi - s}{\epsilon^q} \right) \right) \tag{5.16}$$

with undetermined positive constants p, q and r and the shock speed s, as self-similar solutions $U(x,t) = \phi(x/t) \equiv \phi(\xi)$ of Dafermos regularized equation (5.7). In particular, singular shocks require $q > 1$, which means that the essential support of the layer in singular shocks must have the width $|\xi - s| = O(\epsilon^q) = o(\epsilon)$; namely, *singular shock layer should be narrower than a conventional shock profile* $O(\epsilon)$. As for (5.7), positive constants yield $q = 1+p$ and $r = 2p$, say $p = 1, q = 2, r = 2$.

The constraint $p = 1, r = 2$ corresponds to the type of our quasi-Poincaré compactification $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (1, 2)$. See Definition 2.3, where ϵ^{-1} corresponds to κ. The width of singular shock layer in the framework of compactification is described as follows. Firstly, the moving frame coordinate ξ in (5.2) is $\xi = \epsilon^{-1}(x - st)$. Secondly, the desingularized vector field (5.12) evolves under the time scale $d\tau = \kappa^k d\xi$. In the current case, $k = 1$ from Lemma 5.3. As a consequence, the layer corresponding to evolution on W_2 has the width $|x - st| = O(\epsilon\kappa^{-1})$. Around the support of delta singularity, κ^{-1} is close to ϵ, and thus the order of width $O(\epsilon\kappa^{-1})$ describes the width of the layer given in (5.16) except its profile-dependence.

Remark 5.9 (Comparison with [17])**.** Descriptions of W_1 as well as W_3 follows from the approach of [17], namely as blow-up solutions of (5.2) with corresponding constants c_1, c_2. On the other hand, W_2 corresponding to inner solutions in [17] is described in a different way. In [17], the inner solution is described by *homoclinic orbits of non-hyperbolic equilibrium for the differential equation at infinity* which is exactly of the form (5.1), whereas our inner solution W_2 is a *heteroclinic orbit between hyperbolic critical points at infinity*. The difference of our description comes from quasi-homogeneous desingularization mechanism in compactifications. We see that critical points at infinity are "desingularized" under quasi-Poincaré compactifications.

5.6 Final remark : towards rigorous detection of singular shocks

The blow-up behavior for (5.1) will help the analysis of that for (5.2). However, there are several difficulties for concrete analysis. One of the essential difficulties is singularity of the Jacobian matrix Jg at infinity. Direct calculations as (5.15) applied to (5.2) indicates that each component may contain negative power radicals of $1 - p(x)^{2c}$, which make Jg singular at infinity. Quasi-Poincaré compactifications thus involve loss of smoothness, as mentioned in [23] for homogeneous Poincaré compactifications. Unfortunately, we cannot apply theorems in Section 4 to (5.2) for detecting blow-up solutions and singular shocks in the present theory.

This difficulty will lead us to necessity of other quasi-homogeneous compactifications as discussed in [5], which should transform polynomial vector fields into *rational* ones. In the case of homogeneous compactifications, properties corresponding to (A0) $\sim$ (A3) in Proposition 2.6, called admissibility in [5], play important roles to describing dynamics on $\mathcal{D}$ and, under desingularization,

on $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$. Once we can construct other compactifications satisfying all our desiring properties, such compactifications would be widely applied to validating blow-up solutions as well as associating finite-time singularities like singular shocks for any polynomial vector fields, hopefully of other type, too.

On the other hand, even if we can construct other compactifications so that all arguments makes sense in terms of Section 4, there is still a nontrivial problem if the sequence $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^3$ makes sense as a singular shock for (5.3). According to Schecter [18], the existence of Rankine-Hugoniot deficit C and the overcompressibility of shock waves are sufficient to prove the existence of singular shocks for (5.3) with their Dafermos profiles. Geometric singular perturbation theory or other multiscale methods will provide the proof that the observed sequence of trajectories $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^3$ is actually the (singular) limit of Dafermos profiles to singular shocks; namely, $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^3$ rigorously characterizes a singular shock for (5.3).

6 Conclusion

We have discussed a generalized compactification on the basis of quasi-homogeneous desingularizations of singularities. As a prototype, we have introduced the quasi-Poincaré compactification, which generalize well-known Poincaré compactification so that they reflect the quasi-homogeneity of vector fields at infinity. This new compactification respects dynamics which original dynamics possesses, and reduces divergent solutions including blow-up and grow-up solutions to those which tend to the boundary of compactified spaces and dynamics at infinity. Moreover, our construction also indicates that critical points at infinity as well as blow-up solutions can be treated as one of finite-time singularities, which can be applied to similar finite-time singularities such as *extinctions, dead cores, quenching solutions* [2, 8] and *canard solutions* [22].

As an application, we have discussed singular shock profiles for a Riemann problems of a system of conservation laws with numerical simulations. Following preceding works, we have constructed a sequence of trajectories consisting of blow-up solutions involving saddle-type critical points at infinity and a bounded trajectory at infinity through quasi-Poincaré compactification, which captures fundamental features of singular shocks. The demonstration shows an alternative description of delta singularities in dynamical systems.

We end our arguments by showing several future prospects of the present discussions.

General quasi-homogeneous compactifications

In the theory of (admissible) homogeneous compactifications [5], the Poincaré compactification is settled into the central one in the sense that the direction at infinity is distinguished and that the degeneracy of points at infinity is removed as possible. On the other hand, the Poincaré-type compactifications need calculations of radicals, which may break smoothness of (desingularized) vector fields at infinity. There are several admissible compactifications, such as parabolic compactifications, such that polynomial vector fields are mapped into rational ones. They overcome all difficulties coming from radicals appeared in compactifications for studying dynamics. As mentioned below, such an advantage extends the applicability of compactifications to studies of dynamics at infinity such as blow-up solutions.

With this in mind, it is natural to consider the quasi-homogeneous analogue of general admissible compactifications which avoids difficulties coming from radicals. Various properties which quasi-Poincaré compactifications possess in the present arguments will be the basis on constructing an *admissible* class of quasi-homogeneous compactifications. Admissible quasi-homogeneous compactifications which generalize admissible homogeneous compactifications (e.g., [5]) are our next focuses for constructing general theory and applications to, say rigorous numerics of blow-up solutions mentioned below.

Rigorous numerics of blow-up solutions, singular shocks and their Dafermos profiles

Our present arguments are motivated in *rigorous numerics* of trajectories in dynamical systems with certain singularities, such as blow-up solutions, and Riemann solutions admitting singular shocks in systems of conservation laws (e.g., [19, 20, 18]). Rigorous numerics, mainly based on *interval arithmetic*, are ones of numerical computation techniques which encloses all numerical errors such as truncation or rounding errors with appropriate mathematical estimates. Interval arithmetic enables us to compute enclosures where mathematically correct objects are contained in the phase space. These enclosures give *explicit* error bounds of *rigorous* solutions. In dynamical systems, there are many applications to validations of global trajectories, stability of invariant sets, parameter ranges containing parameter values where the dynamical bifurcations occur with computer assistance (e.g. [14, 24]).

Recently, rigorous numerics are applied to validating blow-up solutions of ODEs [23], which applies (homogeneous) compactifications and Lyapunov functions to enclose rigorous blow-up times of blow-up solutions. One of directions extending arguments in [23] is the application of the present theory, which will lead to validate blow-up solutions of (asymptotically) quasi-homogeneous systems such as (5.2). Arguments in Section 5 indicate that such arguments will further lead to validate singular shock waves for various systems. As indicated in [10, 18], concrete profiles of singular shocks are described in the framework of Dafermos regularizations, which belongs to fast-slow systems. Our tools with rigorous numerics for fast-slow systems [13] will give us a method for validating not only singular shocks but also their concrete Dafermos profiles. However, as mentioned in [23], the Poincaré-type compacifications, including quasi-homogeneous ones, cannot be applied in certain cases because of the presence of radicals in desingularized vector fields, which precludes us from validating Lyapunov functions, discussed in Section 4, around critical points at infinity. Construction of general quasi-homogeneous compactifications are thus needed for avoiding such difficulties.

An alternative characterization of singular shocks

Our discussions in Section 5 show a different characterization of singular nature in singular shocks, which lead to a nontrivial problem if our observed objects actually characterize singular shocks in an appropriate sense. To this end, typical approaches such as asymptotic expansions of solutions or geometric singular perturbation theory in preceding works would be suitable.

In preceding works such as [17, 18], inner solutions characterizing delta singularity is described by homoclinic orbits of a *non-hyperbolic* equilibrium for a limit dynamical system at infinity. This characterization plays a fundamental role to self-similarity of singular shocks as a singular limit of

Dafermos regularizations with the assistance of *blow-up (i.e., desingularization) of non-hyperbolic singularities* (e.g., [18]).

On the other hand, our characterization of "inner solutions" (W_2 in Section 5) rely on heteroclinic orbits between *hyperbolic* critical points at infinity, which is due to the quasi-homogeneous desingularization mechanism of our compactifications. This observation leads to a different approach for characterizing singular shocks in terms of Dafermos profiles from preceding works, because equilibria of our focus, namely critical points at infinity, are already sufficiently desingularized under our compactification. In addition to Dafermos profiles for singular shocks, we believe that compactifications will provide characterizations of various phenomena involving infinity in terms of (locally) hyperbolic dynamics.

Acknowledgements

The author was partially supported by Program for Promoting the reform of national universities (Kyushu University), Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan.

A The Hartman-Grobman Theorem : quick review

Here we quickly review a well-known theorem in dynamical systems called *the Hartman-Grobman Theorem*, which provides the topological equivalence between a (nonlinear) dynamics and its linearization around hyperbolic equilibria. In this paper, this theorem is applied to describing trajectories on stable manifolds of hyperbolic critical points at infinity. Our review here rely on Robinson's book [16].

Theorem A.1 (Hartman-Grobman, e.g., Theorem 5.3 in [16]). *Let p be a hyperbolic equilibrium for $\dot{x} = f(x)$. Then, the flow φ^t of f is topologically conjugate in a neighborhood of p to the affine flow $p + e^{At}(y - p)$, where $A = Jf(p)$. More precisely, there are a neighborhood U of p and a homeomorphism $h : U \to U$ such that $\varphi^t(h(x)) = h(p + e^{At}(y - p))$, as long as $p + e^{At}(y - p) \in U$.*

This theorem claims that it is essentially sufficient to consider the linearized flow in a neighborhood of hyperbolic equilibria, if we consider the flow, such as (un)stable manifolds, around hyperbolic equilibria.

The Theorem can be proved by the combination of the following "global version" of the Theorem and a composition of smooth bump functions with small supports.

Theorem A.2 (Global version of Theorem A.1, e.g., Theorem 7.1 in [16]). *Let A be an invertible linear map which is hyperbolic; namely, all eigenvalues have nonzero real parts. There exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that if $g \in C^1_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$: a C^1 function to $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose supremum as well as the differential are uniformly bounded with $Lip(g) < \epsilon$, then $f = A + g$ is topologically conjugate to A by a map $h = id + v$ with $v \in C^0_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (continuous and uniformly bounded). The conjugacy h is unique among maps of the form $id + k$ with $k \in C^0_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Furthermore, the function v can be characterized as the implicit function $v = v(g)$ of*

$$\Phi(g, v) \equiv v - A \circ v \circ A^{-1} - g \circ (id + v) \circ A^{-1} = 0$$

for the C^1 map near $(g, v) \equiv (0, 0)$, in which sense $v = v_g$ is continuous with respect to g near $g = 0$.

Theorem A.2 not only provides the existence of conjugacy h but also its explicit form $h = id + v$. In particular, *if the neighborhood U is sufficiently small, then v is chosen to be sufficiently small in the sense of the supremum norm on C^0.*

The local version of the Theorem is proved by the combination of bump functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$: a C^∞ function such that $0 \leq \beta(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and

$$\beta(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } |x| \leq a \\ 0 & \text{for } |x| \geq b \end{cases}$$

for given $0 < a < b$. In particular, we have the following proposition.

Proposition A.3 (cf. Proposition 7.7 in [16])**.** *Let U_0 be an open neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $f : U_0 \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a C^r local diffeomorphism for $r \geq 1$ with $f(0) = 0$ and $A = Jf(0)$. Then, given any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a smaller neighborhood $U \subset U_0$ of 0 and a C^r extension $\bar{f} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\bar{f}|_U = f|_U$, $\bar{f} - A \in C^1_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $Lip(\bar{f} - A) < \epsilon$.*

The original version (Theorem A.1) is proved by applying Theorem A.2 to the extension $\bar{f}$ in the above proposition with $f = \varphi^t$: time-t map of the flow for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Remark that a series of arguments gives not only the topological conjugacy of dynamics around hyperbolic equilibria but also the concrete form of the conjugacy h, which is used in Section 4.

References

[1] M. Brunella and M. Miari. Topological equivalence of a plane vector field with its principal part defined through Newton polyhedra. *Journal of differential equations*, 85(2):338–366, 1990.

[2] A. de Pablo and J.L. Vázquez. Travelling waves and finite propagation in a reaction-diffusion equation. *Journal of differential equations*, 93(1):19–61, 1991.

[3] F. Dumortier. Techniques in the theory of local bifurcations: Blow-up, normal forms, nilpotent bifurcations, singular perturbations. In *Bifurcations and Periodic Orbits of Vector Fields*, pages 19–73. Springer, 1993.

[4] F. Dumortier and R. Roussarie. Canard cycles and center manifolds. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 121(577):x+100, 1996.

[5] U. Elias and H. Gingold. Critical points at infinity and blow up of solutions of autonomous polynomial differential systems via compactification. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 318(1):305–322, 2006.

[6] M. Fila and H. Matano. Blow-up in nonlinear heat equations from the dynamical systems point of view. *Handbook of dynamical systems*, 2:723–758, 2002.

[7] J. Hell. Conley index at infinity. *Ph.D. Thesis in Freie Universität Berlin*, 2010.

[8] B. Kawohl. Remarks on quenching, blow up and dead cores. In *Nonlinear Diffusion Equations and Their Equilibrium States, 3*, pages 275–286. Springer, 1992.

[9] B.L. Keyfitz. Singular shocks: retrospective and prospective. *Confluentes Mathematici*, 3(03):445–470, 2011.

[10] B.L. Keyfitz and H.C. Kranzer. Spaces of weighted measures for conservation laws with singular shock solutions. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 118(2):420–451, 1995.

[11] B.L. Keyfitz, R. Sanders, and M. Sever. Lack of hyperbolicity in the two-fluid model for two-phase incompressible flow. *DISCRETE AND CONTINUOUS DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS SERIES B*, 3(4):541–564, 2003.

[12] H.C. Kranzer and B.L. Keyfitz. A strictly hyperbolic system of conservation laws admitting singular shocks. In *Nonlinear evolution equations that change type*, pages 107–125. Springer, 1990.

[13] K. Matsue. Rigorous numerics for fast-slow systems with one-dimensional slow variable: topological shadowing approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.01462, to appear in Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis*, 2015.

[14] K. Matsue, T. Hiwaki, and N. Yamamoto. On the construction of Lyapunov functions with computer assistance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.05953*, 2016.

[15] H. Poincaré. Mémoire sur les Courbes Définies par une Equation Différentielle. *Oeuvres.*, 1881.

[16] C. Robinson. *Dynamical systems - Stability, Symbolic Dynamics, and Chaos.* Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, second edition, 1999.

[17] D.G. Schaeffer, S. Schecter, and M. Shearer. Nonstrictly hyperbolic conservation laws with a parabolic line. *Journal of differential equations*, 103(1):94–126, 1993.

[18] S. Schecter. Existence of Dafermos profiles for singular shocks. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 205(1):185–210, 2004.

[19] S. Schecter and P. Szmolyan. Composite waves in the Dafermos regularization. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 16(3):847–867, 2004.

[20] S. Schecter and P. Szmolyan. Persistence of rarefactions under Dafermos regularization: blow-up and an exchange lemma for gain-of-stability turning points. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 8(3):822–853, 2009.

[21] J. Smoller. *Shock waves and reaction-diffusion equations*, volume 258 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1994.

[22] P. Szmolyan and M. Wechselberger. Canards in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 177(2):419–453, 2001.

[23] A. Takayasu, K. Matsue, T. Sasaki, K. Tanaka, M. Mizuguchi, and S. Oishi. Numerical validation of blow-up solutions for ordinary differential equations. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 314:10–29, 2017.

[24] D. Wilczak. The existence of Shil'nikov homoclinic orbits in the Michelson system: a computer assisted proof. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 6(4):495–535, 2006.